

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for granting the telephone interview conducted on May 27, 2009 with the Examiner. During the interview, proposed amendments were presented by the applicant's representative. A further explanation regarding the distinction between the claimed subject matter and the prior art references was presented as well. In particular, none of the prior art reference explicitly discloses both the step of saving the contents of the protected area in the first storage device to the second storage device and the step of restoring the contents of the protected area in the first storage device from the second storage device back to the protected area as required in amended independent claims 23, 30, 35, 38, and 42. It was agreed by the Examiner that, a further search of prior art and examination will be conducted regarding the argument and proposed amendments presented during the interview.

By the present amendment, claims 23-26, 29-31, 35, 37, 38, and 42 remain in this application. Claims 27, 28, 32-34, 36, 39-41, and 43-46 are canceled in this amendment while claims 1-22 have been canceled previously. Applicant amends claims 23, 29, 30, 35, 38, and 42 in the present application to more clearly and particularly describe the claimed subject matter. New claims 47-54 have been added without introducing new subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 23-28 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffezzoni (US 6,901,493).

Claims 29 and 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffezzoni in view of Whiting *et al.* (US 2002/0107877, hereinafter "Whiting").

Claims 33 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA") in view of Kawano *et al.* (US 2003/0229768, hereinafter "Kawano").

Claims 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Kawano, and further in view of Maffezzoni.

Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawano in view of Maffezzoni, and further in view of Whiting.

Independent claim 23 has been amended by incorporating the limitations in claims 27, 28, and 33 to distinguish further the claimed subject matter from the cited references. Claim 23 requires both the steps of saving the contents of a protected area in a first storage device to a second storage device and the step of "after said saving, restoring the copied contents of the protected area from the second storage device to the protected area of the first storage device". Claim 23 further requires conducting the steps in a certain sequence. However, none of the cited references teaches both the step of saving the contents of the protected area in the first storage device to the second storage device and the step of restoring the contents of the protected area in the first storage device from the second storage device in such a sequence as required in claim 23. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

Similar to the argument made above with respect to claim 23, independent claims 30, 35, 38, and 42 have been amended to distinguish further the claimed subject matter from the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 30, 35, 38, and 42 be withdrawn.

Claims 24-26, 29, 31, and 37 depend from either one of independent claims 23, 30, and 35 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claims 23, 30, and 35.

Claims 27, 28, 32-34, 36, 39-41, and 43-46 have been canceled in the current amendment while the limitations of these claims have been incorporated into independent claims 23, 30, 35, 38, and 42 as presented above.

Dependent claims 47-54 have been newly added to the application. Claims 47-54 are patentable as they do not introduce any new subject matter (see Fig. 3, and pp. 9, line 25 through pp. 11, line 5), and define further features not disclosed in or suggested by the cited references. Claims 47-54 further require the steps related to the process of restoring the contents of the protected area of the first storage device from the second storage device.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ACER-45196.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700  
Date: June 5, 2009